



December 20, 2001

Mr. Scott A. Kelly  
Deputy General Counsel  
Texas A&M University System  
301 Tarrow, 6<sup>th</sup> Floor  
College Station, Texas 77840-7896

OR2001-6017

Dear Mr. Kelly:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 156711.

The Texas A & M University System (the "system") received four requests for various documents pertaining to an alleged slip-and-fall incident. The requests were received by the system as follows: the first on May 22, 2001, the second on September 24, 2001, the third on October 5, 2001, and the fourth on October 16, 2001. You state that you are providing or have provided documents that are responsive to item 1 of the first request, item 1 of the second request, and items 2 and 5 of the fourth request to the requestor. You also state that the system maintains no documents that are responsive to item 7 of the first request, items 2 through 8 of the second request, items 1 and 5 of the third request, a portion of item 2 of the third request, and item 4 of the fourth request.<sup>1</sup> You claim, however, that the submitted information that is responsive to the third and fourth requests is excepted from disclosure pursuant to section 552.103 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and have reviewed the submitted information.

---

<sup>1</sup> We note that it is implicit in several provisions of the Public Information Act (the "Act") that the Act applies only to information already in existence. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.002, .021, .227, .351. The Act does not require a governmental body to prepare new information in response to a request. *See* Attorney General Opinion H-90 (1973); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 87 (1975), 342 at 3 (1982), 416 at 5 (1984), 452 at 2-3 (1986), 555 at 1-2 (1990), 572 at 1 (1990). A governmental body must only make a good faith effort to relate a request to information which it holds. *See* Open Records Decision No. 561 at 8 (1990).

We first address items 2 through 6 of the first request. You state in a letter dated September 28, 2001 to one of the requestors that items 2 through 6 of the first request are "general inquiries for answers to fact questions, and are not covered by the requirements of the Public Information Act." We note, however, that although the Public Information Act (the "Act") does not require a governmental body to prepare new information in response to a request or prepare answers to questions, it does require that governmental bodies make a good faith effort to relate a request to information which it holds. *See* Open Records Decision No. 561 at 8 (1990). Accordingly, to the extent that the system maintains information that would reasonably be considered to be responsive to items 2 through 6 of the first request, the system must provide this information to the requestor at this time. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.006, .301, .302; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000) (noting that if governmental body concludes that no exceptions apply to requested information it must release information as soon as possible under the circumstances to the extent that it exists).

We now address the submitted information that is responsive to the third and fourth requests for information. Section 552.103 provides in pertinent part:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person's office or employment, is or may be a party.

....

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

Gov't Code, § 552.103(a),(c). The system maintains the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show that the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the governmental body receives the request for information and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *See University of Tex. Law Sch. v. Texas Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.--Austin 1997, no pet.); *see also Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). The system must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a).

A governmental body must provide this office "concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture" when establishing that litigation is reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). Concrete evidence to support a claim that litigation is reasonably anticipated may include, for example, the governmental body's receipt of a letter containing a specific threat to sue the governmental body from an attorney for a potential opposing party.<sup>2</sup> *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 555 (1990), 518 at 5 (1989) (litigation must be "realistically contemplated"). Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *See* Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). You state, and provide documentation showing, that the system has received two letters from the requestor which contain specific threats to sue the system on behalf of the requestor's client if certain demands are not met in a timely manner. Based on our review of your arguments and the submitted information, we conclude that litigation is reasonably anticipated in this matter and that the submitted information is related to the reasonably anticipated litigation for purposes of section 552.103. Accordingly, the system may withhold all of the submitted information from disclosure pursuant to section 552.103 of the Government Code.

However, we note that once information has been obtained by all parties to the litigation through discovery or otherwise, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to that information. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, information that has either been obtained from or provided to the opposing party in the anticipated litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a) and may not be withheld from disclosure on that basis. Further, the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has been concluded. *See* Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days.

---

<sup>2</sup>In addition, this office has concluded that litigation was reasonably anticipated when the potential opposing party took the following objective steps toward litigation: filed a complaint with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, *see* Open Records Decision No. 336 (1982); hired an attorney who made a demand for disputed payments and threatened to sue if the payments were not made promptly, *see* Open Records Decision No. 346 (1982); and threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an attorney, *see* Open Records Decision No. 288 (1981).

*Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at 877/673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.--Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at 512/475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Ronald J. Bounds  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

RJB/seg

Ref: ID# 156711

Enc. Submitted documents

cc: Ms. Ann Braneff  
Attorney at Law  
218 North Main Street  
Bryan, Texas 77803  
(w/o enclosures)